

2



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/452,811	12/02/1999	MASAYUKI CHATANI	991202	1782
25920	7590	09/22/2004	EXAMINER	
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP 710 LAKEWAY DRIVE SUITE 170 SUNNYVALE, CA 94085			DINH, DUNG C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	
DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/452,811

Applicant(s)

CHATANI, MASAYUKI

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-30 and 32-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-30, 32-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2152

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 24, 2004 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 24, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's invocation of the definition in the specification for the meaning of 'primary media content' and 'auxiliary media content' recited in the claims is not persuasive. (See Applicant response of May 24, 2004 page 12). The specification merely define 'primary media content' as consisting as any combination of linear video stream and linear audio stream. There is no specific definition of 'auxiliary media content'. The specification merely discloses that auxiliary content may be advertisements (see Specification page 12). Hence, the current specification does not exclude the

Art Unit: 2152

reading of Collart's contents on the disc as auxiliary media content and the contents from Collart's server as primary media content.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-8, 20-21, 22-23, 25 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Collart US patent
6,453,420.**

As per claim 1, Collart teaches a system for providing access to primary media content in digital form, comprising:

a server network [fig.2] comprising a download management server, database storing user information and primary media content [fig.2 #232, #234, #236];

a client console connectable through a bi-directional communication network to download management server [fig.2], the

Art Unit: 2152

console generating a user identifier (by reading the BCA information);

a detachable storage media [220] installable in the client console, the detachable storage media having data structure thereon comprising auxiliary media content and associated trigger data items [inherent from col.22 lines 41-60. Collart's disc contains various media elements. The disc inherently has information logically associated with the media elements (e.g an index, allocation table, etc.) in order for the playback system to identify what and where each media elements are on the disc to playback], and user identifier [BCA data];

wherein the user identifier is upload to the server to enable access to specified content and user information is downloaded to the client console to trigger execution of specific auxiliary media content items. [See col.15 lines 10-35, col.19 lines 1-9, col.22 line 40 to col.23 line 34]. The identifying data send back from the server specifies the media elements to be played. Hence, the client device inherently does a comparasion to 'trigger' data on the media to retrieve the correct media elements for playback].

As per claims 2 and 4, Collart teaches the user identifier comprises media ID indentifying the storage media and authenitication code [col.15 lines 10-35, col.19 lines 1-9].

Art Unit: 2152

As per claims 3 and 5, Collart teaches using the user identifier to limit access to specified primary content [col.15 lines 30-35, col.23 lines 36-40].

As per claims 6-7, Collart teaches providing a program for providing network access and code to causes execution of program stored on the client console for providing network access [col.14 lines 25-59].

As per claim 8, Collart teaches the client has local fixed storage device [apparent from col. 26 lines 1-25 in order to store the update and application information].

As per claims 20 and 22, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 1 above. Inherently the disc contains plural triggers (eg. content index, storage location on the disc, etc.).

As per claims 21 and 23, Collart teaches providing a program for providing network access and code to causes execution of program stored on the client console for providing network access [col.14 lines 25-59].

As per claim 25, Collart teaches storing a record of the viewing and uploading to the server [col.24 lines 7-9].

Art Unit: 2152

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collart US patent 6,453,420.

As per claim 26, Uranaka does not specifically disclose the console being a personal digital assistant (PDA). The type of device for playing the media would clearly have been a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a PDA because it would have enabled the user to be mobile and to have computing functionality while using the media.

Claims 27-28, 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Hoffberg et al. US patent 6,400,996.

As per claim 27, Hoffberg teaches a system for assessing a fee for auxiliary content comprising:

a server [service provider];

auxiliary content provider [advertiser]; and

Art Unit: 2152

a client node [user] connectable with the server through a communication network for executing playback of auxiliary content stored on a detachable storage media [col.63 lines 41-42],

wherein a fee to the auxiliary content provider is assessed based on the playback record [col.60 lines 10-15].

Hoffberg does not specifically state creating record indicating playback of the auxiliary content, and uploading the record to the server. However, Hoffberg suggests collecting data to at a central system to enable verification and to reduce fraud [see col.63 lines 12-18]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to create record of the playback at the client node because it would have enable the system to efficiently track and verify actual playback of the content.

As per claim 28, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 27 above.

As per claim 40, Hoffberg teaches a server network [service provider] for assessing a fee for auxiliary content [commercials] of auxiliary content provider [advertiser], comprising: a download manager server [col.63 line 25 subscription television system], a customer database and content database [inherent in order to keep track of subscriber and providing content],

wherein the sever receives record indicating playback of the auxiliary content item and accumulate the playback record to

Art Unit: 2152

assess a fee to the auxiliary content provider. [Apparent from col. 60 lines 10-17, col.62 lines 50-68, col. 63 lines 12-24, col.64 lines 39-43; since Hoffberg teaches accounting to collect data to verify receipt of the advertisement]. Hoffberg does not specifically disclosing recieving the record from the client device. However, given the teaching of Hoffberg on col.63 12-24, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to keep record playback at the client device and transmit to the server because it would have enabled efficient and accurate tracking of receipt and playback of the contents].

As per claim 41, Hoffberg teaches the playback record is used to update the customer database [col.64 lines 30-43].

Claims 9-19, 24, 29-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collart US patent 6,453,420 and further in view of Hoffberg et al. US patent 6,400,996.

As per claim 9, Collart teaches a method comprising the steps of:

establishing communication to download managment server
[col.14 lines 10-13];

tranmsitting user identifier contained on the local storage media and a request for primary media content to the server
[col.14 lines 51-59];

Art Unit: 2152

downloading from the server to the client console primary media content and user information [col.20 line 60 to col. 21 lines 6];

accessing auxiliary content on the detachable storage on the basis of the returned user information and overriding playback for enableing viewing of the primary media [col.23 lines 55 to col.24 9];

storing a record of the viewing and uploading to the server [col.24 lines 7-9].

Collart does not teach selectively overriding playback of the auxiliary content. Hoffberg teaches a method of providing auxiliary content on detachable media [col.63 lines 40-44] that enables the user to selectively playback the auxiliary content [col.64 lines 35-42] to earn subsidy for viewing of primary content [col.60 lines 10-15]. Hence it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Hoffberg with Collart because it would have enabled the user to control his option of viewing the auxiliary content for subsidy benefit [see Hoffberg col.60 lines 10-15].

As per claim 13, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 9 above. Collart teaches determining whether connection to the network is required for the operation of the client console [apparent from col.14 lines 5-39: case 2 & 3].

As per claim 24, Collart does not specifically disclose enabling the user to decide whether or not to view the auxiliary content item. The obviousness rationale is as stated for claim 9 above.

As per claims 29+32, 33, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 9 above. Hoffberg teaches assessing fee to auxiliary content provider (advertiser) based on playback records accumulated by the server [see col.60 lines 10-24].

As per claims 10 and 30, Collart teaches having media identifier and authentication code [col.19 lines 1-3]. Collart teaches using the identifier and code to restrict access to primary content [col.23 lines 35-40].

As per claim 12, Hoffberg teaches storing primary content on local storage [col.59 lines 10-15].

As per claims 14-15, and 34-35, Hoffberg discloses monitoring the user "veto" viewing of auxiliary content [col.64 lines 40-43]. It is apparent that the system as modified would have the step of polling to determine if the user overrides the playback of auxiliary content and to update viewing record accordingly. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so because it would have enabled the system to keep accurate record of the user's viewing.

Art Unit: 2152

As per claims 16-18, and 35-38, the timing of the upload of the viewing record would clearly have been a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to upload the viewing record at various times as the situation required.

As per claims 19 and 39, Collart teaches prompting the user for user information and to associate with the user with the media identifier [col.20 lines 59-60].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner